

**REMARKS**

In the final Office Action dated July 12, 2005, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-31. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims. Following entry of the amendments, claims 1-9, 11-12, 23-25, 28-30 and 32-39 will be pending.

Each of the claims as amended requires use of a label appended to a packet to route the packet internally within a node of a network, between circuit cards. The amendments to the previously pending claims are intended to emphasize this and avoid any confusion with use of labels to switch packets between nodes using, for example, MPLS. New claims 33-39 are not being inserted in response to the rejection.

The primary reference relied on the Examiner, US 6,647,428 (Bannai et al.), describes the use of several different packet formats. One is referred to as the "OPTnet packet" format. It is used for routing packets between virtual devices within a network. Col. 3, lines 34-37. It is not used for internal routing. An OPTnet packet, which resembles an Ethernet packet with an MPLS label stack. Col. 2, lines 4-6. The OPTnet label is attached to a packet prior to its egress from a physical port at a node.

Bannai et al. also describes a variation of this packet format that is used by a switching card that is responsible for providing all data to any tributary interface card across a back plane within a device. See Col. 8, lines 63-65. The packet format is illustrated in figure 6. The packet includes an egress port ID that enables tributary interface cards that do not contain a switch fabric to easily determine which output port on which to send the data within the packet. Col. 9, lines 4-8.

It is respectfully submitted that neither of these packet formats suggest using a label for internally routing packets to circuit cards within a node device, or disclose a label to be used for routing between circuit cards within the same node or device, as required by the claims. The port ID, which the Examiner references in the rejections, simply informs the tributary interface card which physical port the data should be sent out on. It is not used for internally routing the packet

to the tributary interface card. Furthermore, the egress port ID does not identify the circuit card by shelf or by locating, such as by shelf and slot number, as required by several of the dependent claims.

The other reference relied upon in support of the rejection, U.S. Patent No. 6,795,917 (Ylonen) does not describe or suggest use of a label appended to a packet for internal routing of packet within a node.


Therefore, for these reasons, the combination of Bannai et al and Ylonen cannot render obvious any of the claims.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks. Please telephone the undersigned representative should he be of any assistance in connection with the reconsideration.

In the event that any fees are due with respect to the filing of this paper, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charged Deposit Account No. 13-4900 of Munsch Hardt Kopf & Harr, P.C., referencing Attorney Docket No. 5022.7-1.

Respectfully submitted,  
Munsch Hardt Kopf & Harr P.C.



Marc A. Hubbard  
Registration No. 32,506

Date: 1-06-06

Correspondence to:  
Munsch Hardt Kopf & Harr, P.C.  
3800 Lincoln Plaza  
500 N. Akard Street  
Dallas, Texas 750201-6659  
Tel. (214) 855-7544; Fax. (214) 978-5323  
Customer No. 23559